

that air piracy is not an exclusively North American headache, and is likely to be less and less so. It threatens, in fact, to become a specialized form of guerrilla warfare with world-wide implications; and one of its worrisome aspects is that it's the kind of crime likely to occur precisely in the world's hottest trouble spots, where emotions are already seething.

The conditions that seem to encourage skyjackings are bitter hostility between two nations or national groups that are geographically close, one of them—or each of them—having many of the other's nationals on its territory. The elements are present in many areas—the United States and Cuba; Israel and the Arab nations; southeast Asia; Greece, Turkey, and Cyprus. And all that's needed to activate them is a single fanatic with a gun.

The crime has a reckless, dramatic quality that appeals to the fanatic mind, and it gives at least a symbolic opportunity for an individual to injure a whole nation, to revenge himself on a government he hates.

So far no lasting damage has been done, but yesterday's piracy of the El Al jet liner carried an ominous hint: After the skyjackers had forced it to land in Algeria, the Palestine Liberation organization, an extremist Arab group, urged the Algerian government to hold the 18 Israelis aboard as hostages for Arab commandos imprisoned in Israel. This would change the crime from an individual act of piracy to a severe international provocation and invite reprisals; it would also call for emergency action by the United Nations. Israel has already asked Secretary General Thant to act.

Last week we proposed at least a partial answer: An international agreement, setting severe, uniform, and mandatory penalties for this crime, so that a skyjacker would face certain punishment wherever he stepped off the plane. The International Civil Aviation organization in Montreal could initiate this move if one of its members proposed it, and we believe the United States should propose it.

Enforcement, of course, would be a problem; nations that didn't feel like obeying the skyjacking law would simply ignore it, as Cuba ignores present laws on air piracy. But international sanctions against this crime would at least tend to discourage it—and it clearly needs discouraging fast.

#### LANDMARK HOUSING LEGISLATION

(Mr. DOW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, the housing legislation that we expect to come before us today for the final time will be a landmark not only for the 90th Congress but in the history of our Nation. It will provide the tools for accomplishing a stated policy of over a decade—"a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family." For too long this policy has been nothing more than idle words—our action today can make it a reality.

In the first year alone, we can double the production of housing for low- and moderate-income families to 300,000 units. This bill is the first step in a 10-year effort that will produce 6 million housing units for such families and replace the substandard units where over 20 million Americans are forced to live today. Families who in the past have effectively been denied the American dream of homeownership would be given the initial financial boost they need to buy homes. Other families would have

the opportunity for decent rental housing that meets their needs by paying a reasonable one-fourth of their incomes.

Although reaching the goals set out in this legislation will require a volume of housing far greater than in the past, the goal is not unrealistic. We have in this legislation sound, flexible, and imaginative tools for achieving that goal. For the first time we will be able to tap the resources of private industry to attack the housing problem. The subsidy for homeownership will create a substantial market for low- and moderate-cost housing which does not exist today. I have every confidence that the home-building industry can and will respond.

Through the national housing partnership, the financial and management resources of private enterprise will be used to solve the housing problem on a national scale. The productivity of the private sector of the American economy is unmatched anywhere in the world. This legislation will unleash the huge potential of private enterprise, so it can produce the large volume of housing we must have.

As President Johnson said earlier this year in his message on housing and cities:

The Government's concern is to stimulate private energy and local action—to provide capital where needed, to guarantee financing, to offer assistance that encourages planning and construction.

At this time when America's housing needs are so great, the plight of our poor urban dwellers so desperate, the crisis of our cities so deep, an alliance between private enterprise and Government is both realistic and wise. I hope my fellow Members will join with me in showing compassion for the needs of our cities and a commitment to meeting those needs by voting for this legislation.

#### PROGRAM INFORMATION ACT

(Mr. ROTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, the response to two legislative proposals which I have introduced with cosponsors in the House to improve the efficiency of our Federal Government has been most gratifying. These two bills are H.R. 18113, the Program Information Act, which would require the President, through the Bureau of the Budget, to issue and maintain an up-to-date catalog on Federal assistance programs, and H.R. 18574, "the Executive Reorganization and Management Improvement Act."

I am pleased to report that currently we have more than one-fourth of the membership of the House as cosponsors of each of these legislative proposals. As of today, 120 Members, Democrats and Republicans, are cosponsors of the Program Information Act, and 128 Members are cosponsors of the reorganization legislation.

Equally significant, is the fact that other key Government officials have gone officially on record in support of this legislation. I am highly pleased to report that the National Governors' Conference,

which held its 16th annual meeting this week in Cincinnati, Ohio, unanimously adopted a resolution endorsing both proposals. The adoption of this resolution was again a bipartisan effort.

In a bipartisan spirit, the distinguished Governor of Delaware, Charles L. Terry, Jr., drafted and proposed the resolution that was adopted by the conference. This effort was aided by the able Gov. Spiro Agnew of Maryland. As I have indicated, this resolution was unanimously adopted by the conference, which was attended by 48 Governors.

This resolution provides:

#### IMPROVED MANAGEMENT AND REPORTING OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Whereas, there are more than 1,270 Federal programs offering assistance to local and state governmental units; and

Whereas, these programs are operated by various agencies of the federal government and in many instances have become competitive and overlapping; and

Whereas, the overall effect of the number, complexity and duplication is to create a situation of difficulty and confusion; and

Whereas, this difficulty and confusion could be alleviated by the annual publication of a complete compendium of federal assistance programs and by the establishment of a commission for the improvement of government management and organization insofar as they affect state and local governmental units:

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Sixtieth Annual National Governors' Conference assembled in Cincinnati, Ohio on the twenty-third day of July, 1968 go on record as supporting (1) the annual publication by the federal government of a complete compendium of all operating programs offering assistance to state and local governmental units, and (2) the creation on the national level of a commission for the improvement of government management and organization insofar as they affect state and local governmental units such as the commission envisioned by H. R. 18113.

I would also like to report that the National Association of Counties has written me of their endorsement of H.R. 18113. This important association represents the chief executives of our county governments. Mr. Bernard F. Hillenbrand, executive director, wrote me as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES,  
Washington, D.C., July 18, 1968.

Hon. WILLIAM V. ROTH,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROTH: I am writing to note this Association's support of your bill, H.R. 18113, the Program Information Act. We commend you on your leadership in seeking the creation of a catalogue of Federal assistance programs which would identify for potential beneficiaries all existing Federal assistance programs wherever administered. Certainly, as Federal programs have grown in number and complexity, county officials have long needed the complete, master reference work which you envision.

A number of the dramatic catalogue features which you would require would prove immensely helpful to county officials. Requirements that the President revise the catalogue at no less than monthly intervals, that the catalogue state the level of funding for each program and that there be a statement of the cost to the recipient of receiving assistance and of duties required after receiving benefits can assist county governments in making more informed judgments relating to Federal assistance programs.

Section 10 of your bill, as introduced, re-

quires that the catalogue shall be the only compendium of program information published by any Federal agency or department. This master list or reference point is needed and laudatory; at the same time, we would hope that various Federal agencies would still have leave to develop and disseminate information in depth relating to programs within their jurisdiction in supplementation of the catalogue.

Your proposal includes machinery for the constant improvement, simplification and consolidation of the many program forms and guidelines and this too should help to improve an area that has been the cause of much frustration in county circles nationally. Your efforts can lead to substantial strengthening of our Federal system.

Sincerely,

BERNARD F. HILLENBRAND,  
Executive Director.

In my judgment, endorsements by the National Governors' Conference, the National Association of Counties, one-fourth of the membership of the House, and a number of newspapers and editorial writers which have been reprinted recently in these pages, clearly shows the broad consensus of support that has developed around these two proposals seeking to bring about more efficient and effective machinery to solve the grave problems we face at all levels of government.

#### NELSEN PROTESTS CUTBACKS IN POSTAL SERVICE

(Mr. NELSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much from the Postmaster General during the past few days, both through the press and in testimony before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, concerning reduction in postal services, some of which have already been put into effect and others which are planned, programed, or threatened. The reasons given for these actions are the expenditure reductions and employment restrictions in the recent tax increase bill. First let me say that these threats are in line with statements we have been hearing from other agencies, which have threatened catastrophic results in services rendered if their particular agency is affected by these expenditure cuts.

For example, Budget Director Charles J. Zwick has been quoted as saying that the following programs would be among those bearing the brunt of the reductions: Elementary and secondary education, cancer and heart research, rural electrification and telephone loans, veterans' medical care, anticrime activities, maternal and child welfare grants, school lunch and food stamp programs, and air and water pollution control.

Significantly, we have heard almost nothing about the possibility of reducing spending in such fields as the space program, new public works projects, the supersonic transport program, the foreign aid program, and others. Few of these programs are ever mentioned as areas for potential cuts.

The point is that the Director of the Budget and, in this case, the Postmaster General are stating directly and/or im-

plying that unless Congress exempts, for example, the Post Office Department from the requirements of the reductions and spending cuts in the recent tax bill, these many essential services and programs will bear the brunt of such reductions. And, of course the services, the discontinuance of which would stir maximum public reaction, are always the ones principally mentioned to go under the knife—this in the hope, of course, of promoting a congressional exemption from the cuts for the agency or department. The simple truth is that the Director of the Budget presently has complete discretionary authority under the recent tax legislation to assign these personnel cuts to those agencies in a manner which will have the least disturbing effect on the public service. He has the authority, for instance, to exempt the Post Office Department in whole or in part if such be necessary.

Through the use of this authority a reasonable system of priorities should be applied throughout the Government service to leave essential services and programs untouched and to cut out the waste. There is no agency, bureau, or department in the Federal Government that is run so efficiently that savings cannot be made in selected places in both personnel and money during these times of financial crisis.

With these options open to the administration, I do not think that we who believe in reasonable reduction in Government spending must be intimidated by these not-so-subtle blackmail threats.

I believe that this postal crisis situation could be solved tomorrow through the exercise by the administration of prerogatives which it already holds without further congressional action.

For the moment, however, I certainly agree with the concern of the folks back home over the actual and threatened cuts. I shall attempt to find out just how much the Postmaster General intends to save by his proposed cutbacks and then if there is no other solution—that is if the administration refuses to act sensibly in adjusting priorities for these reductions—I shall as a last resort support a move to rescind the overall expenditure cut in an amount to take care of these necessary postal services. But I think we as a Congress should not and need not now start legislating blanket exemptions for various departments or agencies or it will not be but a short time before the cuts and reductions in Government spending written into the tax bill will be "gone with the wind."

For the future, serious consideration should be given to the recent results of the blue-ribbon task force study which recommended that the Post Office Department be reorganized into a non-political Government-owned corporation. So far this report has been given a cold shoulder by both the President and the Postmaster General.

#### TODAY THERE ARE CELEBRATIONS IN CUBA

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today, the 26th of July, there will be celebrations in Cuba. There will be celebrations because Fidel Castro says there will be celebrations.

But indeed, there is little for the people of Cuba to celebrate. July 26, the day that Castro started his march to power in Cuba, must ironically and realistically represent the day that the people of Cuba were betrayed.

Today's celebration in Cuba will be in honor of Fidel Castro, not the Cuban people and not the Cuban nation. The nation has been delivered by Castro into the hands of communism and the people of Cuba have been delivered into poverty, hunger, and hopelessness.

For these reasons, I was surprised to read the unrealistic comments of a Member of the Senate this week. This Member of the Senate proposed that the United States change its position toward Cuba, recognize the Communist government there and in effect loosen the economic isolation which we have employed against Cuba.

He says that the people of Cuba are better off now than they were before Castro. This is not only unrealistic, but shows either a lack of knowledge on the present state of affairs in Cuba, or a refusal to recognize the fact that Castro has turned that island nation from one of the most prosperous countries in Latin America into the beggar nation of the Communist world.

I would like to just touch on a few points to indicate what Castro has done to a nation which was well on its way to self-sufficiency.

The Cuban economy is in shambles. The gross national product in 1967 was approximately the same as it was in 1959—\$2.5 billion—despite the increase in population and vast scientific and technical advances in methods of farming and manufacturing.

The per capita annual income has dropped since Castro took over. Before Castro, Cuba rated third in Latin America in per capita income.

Before Castro, Cuba's domestic production satisfied domestic demand for poultry, eggs, beef, milk, cheese and butter and most other foodstuffs. Now there are severe rations on food. Cubans are limited to three-fourths of a pound of meat per week, or about 3 pounds per month when it is available and it is not always available. Milk is rationed for those under 5 years of age. Coffee is limited to ounces per month. Eggs and bread are hard to come by.

Clothing is also on the scarce list. The ration book in February, 1968, entitled each person to buy two shirts, one pair of trousers and two pairs of shoes a year. But shoes are often impossible to find.

Before Castro, Cuba had one of the world's leading sugar crops. But since Castro took over, Cuba has never matched the peak production established prior to his regime. This, despite the fact that he has disrupted the entire economy in mad attempts to set records. As a result, all other phases of the economy have suffered, including the educational processes and the routine duties of government.

Before Castro, Cuba's oil and petroleum industry was helping stabilize the economy, producing enough for domestic use and exporting much abroad. Now Cuba has to call on Russia for oil and petroleum imports. Many refineries have been closed down. Again, this has contributed to placing a dependency on sugar as the country's only economic product.

In addition, Castro has not been content to bring ruin to Cuba. He has tried to export communism to other Latin American countries, most notably Bolivia, where Che Guevara led an unsuccessful attempt to overthrow the Government.

I think the Senator should look over these facts. And I think others in the Government who would advocate recognizing Cuba and who urge that we open trade and diplomatic relations with her consider these things. I might add that if Cuba were situated in Lake Erie, I think the Senator would have a different view.

And I think that those who promote the idea that Cubans are satisfied with the dictatorship of Fidel Castro ask themselves why have more than 350,000 Cubans fled their homeland for asylum in the United States.

In 1959, Castro promised free elections within 4 years. There have been none. Nor do I think there will be.

We have no way of knowing what Castro will use as the theme of his annual 26th of July speech. But I would suspect that it might be that he intends to continue to export communism to our sister nations of South America.

There is no reason, on this tragic day, why any American should welcome Fidel Castro into the community of free nations of the Western Hemisphere. And I certainly would oppose any such proposal as long as Fidel Castro and the Communist regime are in power there.

The people of Cuba have been betrayed. Their nation has been delivered into bondage. The peoples of the free world can only recognize the 26th of July as the anniversary of the death of a free people.

#### GUN-CONTROL LAWS MISS MARK

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Plain Dealer, in its editorial of yesterday, sets forth a very reasonable analysis of the gun and ammunition control bill which the House passed Wednesday. The need for legislation to control and regulate traffic in ammunition and firearms in an effort to stop or at least lessen violence is imperative. The bill which passed is a first step, inadequate though it may be. I am pleased that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, has stated that hearings will be held in September on the latest proposal by President Johnson which was embodied in the bill which the chairman introduced, H.R. 18181.

The tragic spectacle of killings by firearms in Cleveland shows a crying need

for legislation to protect the lives of our citizenry. The Cleveland Plain Dealer is to be congratulated for its very cogent editorials in the public interest on the subject of control and regulation of ammunition and firearms. By permission, I include yesterday's Plain Dealer editorial, to which I have referred:

#### GUN CONTROL LAWS MISS MARKS

There is a bitter lesson for all America in the story of the deadly sniper attack on Cleveland policemen, a lesson about guns.

Federal firearms control laws so far enacted or contemplated fall far short of what the country needs.

The snipers who shot the policemen were well armed. They had both handguns and long guns, the latter including shotguns and rapid-fire military type weapons. They had plenty of ammunition for all guns.

No law now on the books makes it impossible for a dangerous person to obtain handguns, shotguns, ordinary rifles or even semi-automatic weapons such as those used by the Cleveland snipers.

The fully-automatic guns which police said were used in the East Side shootout are another matter, however.

Such rapid-fire weapons are meant for military use. When they show up on the home front, it is evidence that the users have avoided federal surveillance and violated federal law. The law requires those who possess fully automatic weapons to be registered through the payment of a \$200 ownership transfer tax and the posting of a \$5,000 surety bond.

That modern military weapons could be, and were, used by snipers to gun down Cleveland policemen is one shock for Americans.

That members of Congress, only a few hours after the Cleveland violence, could act favorably on only the mildest sort of gun control legislation, is a second shock.

The similar bills approved by the House of Representatives and the Senate Judiciary Committee are weakened versions of President Johnson's proposal to prohibit the mail order sale of rifles, shotguns and ammunition.

The House measure which now goes to the Senate contains large loopholes. Its ammunition clause refers only to bullets for handguns, not rifles and shotguns. Among other things, it exempts shipments from the National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice to persons enrolled in the million-member National Rifle Association.

It can be said that even with its exceptions, the House bill is welcomed. It does, after all, provide at least a little more restriction on interstate traffic in guns and ammunition.

It does not, however, provide the strong control the nation needs.

Clearly and forcefully, Americans—and Clevelanders—must bring that fact to the attention of those who represent them in Congress.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF JULY 29

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the request for the program for next

week, we will announce the following program:

H.R. 18785, military construction appropriation bill, fiscal year 1969;

H.R. 18249, to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964—open rule, 1 hour of debate;

H.R. 17126, extension of Food and Agriculture Act of 1965—open rule, 2 hours of debate;

H.R. 12843, to provide for a National Eye Institute—open rule, 1 hour of debate—the rule for which has been adopted today;

H.R. 15757, Health Manpower Act of 1968—open rule, 1 hour of debate—the rule for which has been adopted today;

House Resolution 1239, authorizing a Special Committee To Investigate and Report on Campaign Expenditures of Candidates for the House of Representatives;

House Resolution 1247, to grant additional travel authority to the Committee on Public Works;

S. 2484, extension of New Senate Office Building site—open rule, 1 hour of debate;

H.R. 18209, amending the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act—open rule, 1 hour of debate;

H.R. 17685, supplemental air transportation—open rule, 1 hour of debate;

H.R. 11618, to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish or wildlife—open rule, 1 hour of debate, making in order the committee substitute for purpose of amendment;

H.R. 15681, Foreign Military Sales Act—open rule, 1 hour of debate;

S. 633, Foreign Services Information Officers Corps—open rule, 1 hour of debate; and

H.R. 14314, trust funds for educational scholarships and child care centers—open rule, 1 hour of debate.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program may be announced later.

#### ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, JULY 29

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the distinguished minority leader whether as a matter of preparation for the adjournment over until September 4, we might at some time next

July 26, 1968

week ask that the suspension and consent calendars which would be in order on Monday, September 2 be put over until Tuesday, September 10?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As I have indicated to the majority leader, I personally have no objection to such a request being granted inasmuch as we—

Mr. ALBERT. I see that my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, is trying to urge me to make the request right now.

Would the gentleman from Iowa object if I made the request right now?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Iowa will object if you ask for that unanimous consent right now.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman from Oklahoma really respects the opinion of the gentleman from Iowa and would not under the circumstances consider making the request at this time.

#### A SELF-SUPPORTING POSTAL SERVICE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON) for 20 minutes.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, the adequacy and the problems of our Nation's postal system have—even despite Vietnam, political campaigns and gun control laws—briefly become front-page news items.

In the first instance, we have recently seen the release of the report of the President's Commission on Postal Organization which—pointing to the inadequacies of the present management system and the service's consequent and constant loss record—urgently recommends a major reorganization of the system; and, in the second instance, we have heard much of Postmaster General Watson's plea for relief from the recently-enacted job-cut requirements of the surtax package lest he be thereby required to sharply curtail postal services in order to comply with the same.

Both events, of course, are interrelated. And both demand the urgent, but objective, consideration by the appropriate committees of this Congress, and by this Congress, itself, during whatever may still remain of this session.

All of us are receiving—speaking of mail—an increasing amount of constituent mail these days relative to Mr. Watson's well-publicized threat to eliminate such as Saturday mail deliveries in residential areas along with all post office window service on Saturdays, to deny extension of delivery service to all new communities or suburban developments, to accelerate the elimination of rural—fourth-class—post offices so that all will be shut down in about 4 years, and so on.

These, to many persons, are disturbing developments—and unhappy prospects—with the possible exception of that rather surprisingly large number of regular letter carriers who appear to endorse the idea of no residential mail deliveries on Saturday so that they, like

their counterparts in private-enterprise jobs, can also enjoy the advantages of a straight 5-day work week. These workers, in this attitude, seem to be at some odds with their national associations that, of course, must also be concerned about the jobs of substitute carriers, utility men, and so on.

Be that as it may, it is certain that this Congress—in this election year—will be most sensitive to the public attitude toward all this as it further develops.

Mr. Speaker, if my mail from my constituents on this subject has been anything like that of my colleagues, it would seem that there is a general lack of public understanding as to the real reason for Postmaster General Watson's dilemma and for his cry for help.

For much of my mail to date is calling upon me to "give the Post Office some more money" so that these curtailments of service need not take place.

However, money for once is not the problem—at least not the whole problem—for this Congress has already acted on the Postal Department's budget for this fiscal year and has given it enough to operate at normal levels of service between now and next June 30 as best as this can ever be anticipated in advance.

At the same time, when this Congress enacted what has become known as the surtax package—and which has now been signed into law—that package contained a little-discussed and, evidently, little-noticed section under which it was agreed that, with respect to permanent full-time civilian employees in the executive branch, only three out of every four vacancies henceforth occurring could be filled until such time as the overall number of such employees got back down to the level of June 30, 1966.

The section also stated that, in the case of temporary or part-time employees, the number of such in any department or agency in any month could not exceed the number of such employees in the corresponding month in 1967. This, offhand, would seem to give the Post Office Department some slight measure of relief—at least at such times as the forthcoming, heavy-mail Christmas season—though I have not seen this partial escape hatch mentioned in any published reports of the Postmaster General's pleas to the Ways and Means Committee—where he first turned for relief—or elsewhere, now that he has had to find a more sympathetic ear. Nor, in the same way, have I seen much public attention given to the fact, at least as I read the job-cut section of the surtax bill, that the Bureau of the Budget is authorized to allocate the reduced levels of Federal employees among our numerous departments and agencies as best it can, which would seem to mean that it could permit the Post Office Department to go on filling vacancies, as might be needed, so long as other vacancies were left unfilled elsewhere throughout the Federal establishment.

And then, finally along this same line, the surtax package section aimed at reducing overall Federal employment did also exempt from its mandate "casual" employees—however this might be defined for postal purposes—along with up

to 70,000 summer employees from the ranks of the "disadvantaged" between the ages of 16 and 22, of which the Post Office aimed to take its share this summer, as well as Presidential appointees, which would at least seem to exempt postmasters and rural carriers from the cutback mandate.

Well, then, why is all this such an immediate problem for the Post Office?

The answer is a two-part one.

First, the mail volume it is called upon to handle goes up automatically every year—and the Department has no control over this. To handle its fiscal 1969 anticipated increase in mail volume, this Congress—in one of the few appropriation bills that have cleared it this year so far—granted the Department enough funds to bring onboard 15,780 new employees, in one category or another. But, as I understand the job-cut section, the Department can now hire none of such new employees—being required, instead, to grapple as best it can with a steadily growing volume of mail with such employees as it already has.

Second, the Department now experiences a high rate of turnover—at something like 20.8 percent for the 1966 pay year—among its some present 716,000 employees, which figure ranks it among the largest of all employers in the United States.

Perhaps if the Department could somehow, overnight, improve employee morale—something I will touch on again in a moment—it could reduce this rate; but, assuming it cannot, even if the Budget Bureau could find enough other vacancies elsewhere to offset postal vacancies over a longer period of time, it could probably not do this on a short term basis.

Thus, something has to give—and the Postmaster General has made it abundantly clear what he thinks that will have to be.

This immediately creates two dilemmas for this Congress, in that, to cope with the situation, it will evidently have to go back on one or the other of two implied promises it has recently made.

The first was a promise to the taxpayers—when it called upon them to take up a notch or two in their taxpaying belts—that it would do what it could to reduce Federal expenditures: so that Uncle Sam would have to tighten his belt, too; and not just on a short term, anti-inflationary basis, by requiring the President to somehow cut back on his fiscal 1969 spending plans by \$6 billion, but on a longer term basis as well, by eventually rescinding some \$8 billion in the President's estimated \$222.3 billion spending pipeline, and by restraining—and even rolling back—the startling and seemingly inevitable recent growth in Federal employment.

The second promise was less specific, but nonetheless implicit in the minds of many. This was a promise to try to give mail patrons better service in return for the recently enacted increase in postal rates—something which, surprisingly enough, now seems to have been almost forgotten since many of the people who now write me about all this now ask why, if the Post Office does not have enough